PCoP Conference
Better Better Prepared for Review

STEVE CONE, CECW-PC

May 2006

INTRODUCTION / PURPOSE

Topics To Be Covered Include:

- OWPR & the Organizati
- Requirements for Review
- Review Process and Products
- Scope of Review
- Common Problems in Review

Directorate of Civil Works

Executive Office

Director of Civil Works (CECW-ZA)
MG Don Riley 3L94 761-0099
Deputy Director of Civil Works (CECW-ZB)
Mr. Steven Stockton 3L92 761-0100
Executive Director (CECW-ZC)
COL Timothy White 3M93 761-0101
Executive Officer
CPT Nikki Tomlin 3M92 761-0103

4 Regional Integration Teams (RIT's) Assigned to Directorate of Military Programs

Assistant Directors

Eastern (NAD, SAD) (CECW-ZE)
LTC David Berczek 3K91 761-0105
Central (LRD, MVD, SWD) (CECW-ZM)
LTC Gregory Gunter ++ 3K94 761-0107
Western (NWD, SPD, POD) (CECW-ZW)
LTC Mark Mines 3K93 761-0108
Planning & Legislative *(Acting)*
Mr. Larry Prather 3K92 761-0106

North Atlantic Division RIT (CEMP-NAD)

Dr. Ed Theriot Chief
3T77 761-5642
Ms. Jessica Fox *Acting Civil Deputy*
3T72 761-5782

Pacific Ocean Division RIT (CEMP-POD)

Mr. Lloyd Pike* Chief
3Z10 761-1839
Mr. Gil Kim Civil Deputy
3U42 761-7094

South Pacific Division RIT (CEMP-SPD)

Mr. Joe Calcara Chief
3T55 761-0579
Dr. Christine Altendorf Civil Deputy
3T61 761-0415

Southwestern Division RIT (CEMP-SWD)

Ms. Patricia Rivers* Chief
3T50 761-0858
Mr. John Meador Civil Deputy
3T46 761-7687

Great Lakes & Ohio River Division RIT (CECW-LRD)

Mr. David Barnes* Chief
3E92 761-1983
Dr. Larry Lang* Civil Deputy
3D94 761-4670

Mississippi Valley Division RIT (CECW-MVD)

Mr. Tom Waters* Chief
3G92 761-0115
Mr. Zoltan Montvai Civil Deputy
3F94 761-4495

Northwestern Division RIT (CECW-NWD)

Mr. Ed Hecker* Chief
3B92 761-4601
Ms. Carol Angier Civil Deputy
3C93 761-4605

South Atlantic Division RIT (CECW-SAD)

Mr. Don Basham* Chief
3H92 761-8826
Mr. Michael Klosterman Civil Deputy
3G96 761-4106

Office of Homeland Security (CECW-HS)

Mr. Ed Hecker* Chief
3B92 761-4601
Vacant Deputy Chief
3H49 761-4966

Planning Community Of Practice (CECW-CP)

Mr. Tom Waters* Chief
3G92 761-0115
Mr. Harry Kitch Deputy
3 I 27 761-4127

Engineering & Construction Community of Practice (CECW-CE)

Mr. Donald Basham, PE* Chief
3H92 761-8826
Mr. Don Dressler, PE Deputy
3L21 761-5533
DOD Team
Mr. Albert Young Team Ldr.
3U01 761-7419
Construction & Technical Integration Team
Mr. M.K. Miles, PE Team Ldr.
3L35 761-5532
Engineering Tech. Svcs. Team
Mr. Eric Halpin Team Ldr.
3L26 761-7775

Policy & Policy Compliance Division (CECW-P)

Mr. Tom Waters* Chief
3G92 761-0115
Mr. Raleigh Leef Dep. Chief
3F20 761-1380
Policy Branch
Ms. Rennie Sherman Chief
3H25 761-7771
Ofc. of Water Project Review
Ms. Robyn Colosimo Chief
3F21 761-8647

Operations & Regulatory Community of Practice (CECW-CO)

Mr. Gerald Barnes* Chief
3E92 761-1983
Dr. Larry Lang* Deputy
3D94 761-4670
Navigation & Operations
Mr. Barry Holliday
3H31 761-8648
Regulatory Programs
Dr. Mark Sudol
3 I 30 761-8560
Natural Resources Mgmt.
Vacant
3H26 761-1228

Programs Integration Division (CECW-I)

Mr. Gary Loew* Chief
3 I 92 761-4100
Mr. Bill Augustine* Dep. Chief
3 I 93 761-4117
Program Development Team
Mr. Pete Luisa* Team Ldr.
3J93 761-1917
National Programs Team
Mr. Jack Jurentkuff Team Ldr.
3J75 761-4091
Project Programs Team
Vacant Team Ldr.
3J76 761-1882
Future Directions Team
Ms. Jennifer Greer Team Ldr.
3 I 88 761-4113

Program & Project Mgmt Community of Practice (CECW-CB)

Mr. Gary Loew* Chief
3 I 92 761-4100
Ms. Mary Gauker Deputy
3 I 63 761-1811

* Dual or triple-hatted ++ Deployed to CENTCOM AAR


Thomas W. Waters, Chief
Lucille Clark, Secretary
POLICY AND POLICY COMPLIANCE DIVISION
Raleigh Leef, Deputy Chief
Susan Ragon, Administrative Officer
Carolyn Blakey, Secretary
PLANNING COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE
Deputy Chief, Harry Kitch
Skip Fach
Margaret Johanning
Paul Rubensein
Philomena Herasingh, Secretary
Vacancy
Vacancy (Getzen)*
POLICY BRANCH
Rennie Sherman, Chief
Ellen Cummings
Jan Rasgus**
Rich Worthington**
OFFICE OF WATER PROJECT REVIEW
Robyn Colosimo, Chief
Steve Cone, Senior Advisor
Kim Smith (PCA Model Development)
Patricia (Trish) Bee, Program Analyst
Victoria Washington, Secretary
Formulation & Economics Team
James Warren, Team Leader
Bruce Carlson
Clifford Fitzsimmons
Jeff Groska
Thomas Hughes
Miguel Jumilla
John Micik
Rebecca Moyer
Patricia Mutschler
Charles (Lee) Ware
Environmental Team
Vacant , Team Leader (Einarsen)
John Furry
Jeanette Gallihugh
Mark Matusiak
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY DIVISION REGIONAL INTEGRATION TEAM
CW Core Members
Deputy Chief CW, Zoltan Montvai
Wesley Coleman
Planner – Vacant (Hughes)
John Lucyshyn
Mark Pointon
MP Core Members
Deputy Chief MP, Kip Huston
John Berezniak (#)
George Boguslawski (#)
David Olson (#)
Sharron DaCosta (#)
Penny Williams, Secretary
*Chief, Environmental Planner, GS-15, supervised by Leef & Waters
**Senior Policy Advisor, GS-15, supervised by Leef & Waters
(#) Work principally on CW

Technical And Policy Review Process



ROLES AND RESPONSIBILIIES
Policy Compliance Review Team

- Managed by OWPR (CECW-PC)
- Other Members include:
  - Regional Integration Teams
  - Programs Management (CECW-B)
  - Real Estate (CERE)
  - Office of the Chief Counsel (CECC)
  - Engineering (CECW-E)
  - Operations (CECW-O)

CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD REVIEWER

- Strong Planning Background
- Familiar with WRDAs and Other Laws
- Good Writer and Communicator
- Experience with Many Project Purposes

THE REVIEW PARADOX

- **Negative - The reviewer is looking for flaws and errors.**

- **Positive - Review comments are intended to help, and make the product better and the decision better.**

LIMITS ON THE REVIEW

- Review will normally not be revisited (unless changes are made in final documentation or the results are causing the plan formulation process to produce unreasonable or inconsistent results).

- Policy issues should be forwarded for resolution to MSC and HQ's in a timely manner.

REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEW

REQUIREMENTS FOR POLICY REVIEW

- All decision documents (AFB, draft and final reports) must be accompanied by (SEE APPENDIX H):
  - Transmittal letters to MSC-RIT (stating purpose of submittal)
  - RGM, PGM, PSP and other guidance memos as appropriate.
  - Documentation and certification of technical and legal review.

REQUIREMENTS FOR POLICY REVIEW (Cont'd)

- PGM compliance document (applicable to final reports and draft reports following AFB).
- MCACES summary and detail pages.
- Draft reports including NEPA document and all appendices (Eng. REP, etc.) - 10 copies.
- Final Reports - 15 copies.
- **F**inal Feasibility Reports also require DE notice, mailing lists, fact sheet, draft COE report, map, slides, etc.

REVIEW PROCESS AND PRODUCTS

REVIEW PROCESS AND PRODUCTS

Objective of Review Comments Are to Add Value to Decisionmaking Process b

Identification of error/flaw in failure to follow proper procedures, analysis, recommendations which have
material effect on plan components, scope, scale, cost-
sharing, items of local coop, ability to budget

REVIEW PROCESS AND PRODUCTS (Cont'd)

Objective of Review Comments are to Add Value to decision-making process by:

- **Identification of policy/analysis/procedural errors which, though not fatal to report/project at hand, should not be repeated in future reports.**

- **Create opportunity to build support at higher**

BUILDING A RECORD OF REVIEW

- Build and maintain a record of review, responses, actions taken and resolution of issues.

- This is done usually through PGM process.

- It culminates in final review documentation presented to HQ RIT Planning Manager and accompanies reports submitted to decision-makers [ASA, COE, DCG(CW)].

Scope of Review

TYPES OF REVIEW

- Independent Technical Review
- Review Conferences
- Policy Review
- Independent PEER Review
- Washington Level Review
- Public Review

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEWER

- Purpose of Report
- Next Step
- Budget Status
- Prior Guidance



PURPOSE OF REPORT

- Authorization?
- Budget Decision?
- Support the PCA?

NEXT STEP

- Hold AFB
- Prepare Draft Report
- Prepare Final Report
- Conduct PED
- Sign PCA

BUDGET STATUS

- Administration Priority
- Current/Future Funding
- Congressional Add

PRIOR GUIDANCE

- Section 905(b) Analysis/PSP
- Work Allowance Guidance
- IRC Memorandums
- Other Letters/Memorandums
- Similar Issues on Other Projects



COMMENT/RESOLUTION DOCUMENTATION

- Comment
- Response
- Discussion
- Required Action
- Action Taken
- Assessment

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW COMMENTS

4 Principal Elements

- A clear statement of the concern (information deficiency or incorrect application of policy or procedures)
- Basis of the concern (law, policy, guidance)
- Significance of the concern
- Specific actions needed to resolve the

CHECKLISTS AND AREAS OF EMPHASIS

- EC 1165-2-203, Appendix B - Policy Compliance Review Considerations
- ER-1105-2-100, Appendix H
- With and Without Project Assumptions
- Consistency with the Principles and Guidelines
- Cost Apportionment (who pays), especially when a locally preferred plan is proposed
- Commitments and unresolved issues

COMMON PROBLEM AREAS



POLICY REVIEW KEY AREAS ANALYSIS



Policy Review Key Areas

Formulation

- W/o Condition
- Range of Alternatives
- Separable Elements
- Mitigation
- R & U
- Measure All Effects



Plan Selection

- Conformance With Policies
- NED vs LPP
- FSP > NED

Policy Review Key Areas
(Continued)

Project Description

- Costs
- Construction vs LERRD
- Performance
- Residual Risk

Project Implementation

- Cost Allocation
- Cost Apportionment
- Division of Responsibilities
- Credits

Cost Issues

- TPC vs NED
- Associated Costs/LSF
- OMRR&R
- MCACES Mismatch
- Other Direct and Indirect Costs
- Sunk Costs
- IDC
- GNF vs LERR
- Construction vs LERRD

Real Estate

- LERRD vs LERR
- Compensable Interes
- Navigation Servitude
- Non-Standard Estates
- Sponsor Capability
- Land Interest
  - (Fee Title vs. Easement)

Flood Damage Reduction

- Local Drainage
- Historical Reduction
- Reasonableness of Damag
- Future Development
- EO 11988
- Residual Risks
- Benefits During Construction
- Induced Flooding
- Recreation
- Mitigation vs. Restoration



H&SDR

- Historical Damages
- Reasonableness of Dama
- Future Development
- Residual Risks
- Land Damages
- Section 111/101(c)
- Public Use and Access
- Recreation Benefits
- Monitoring

Navigation

- Fleet Forecasts
- Commodity Projections
- Tidal Usage
- Design Draft vs Sailing Dra
- LSF
- Single Owner
- Overdepth Dredging
- Multiple Depth Cost-sharing
- DMMP/DMDF

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

- **Significance of Resources**
- **Mitigation vs. Restoration**
- **“Lumpy” Alternatives**
- **CE/IA**
- **Recreation**
- **NER/NED Trade-offs**

COMMON PROCESS PROBLEMS

COMMON PROBLEMS PROCESS

- Incomplete Document Packages
- Scheduling

- Poor Follow-Up
- Inconsistent Review
- Communications

COMMON PROBLEMS PROCESS

Incomplete Document Packages

- Technical and/or Legal Review
- Insufficient Number of Copies
- No PGM Compliance Document
- Missing Enclosures

COMMON PROBLEMS PROCESS

Scheduling

- Insufficient Time For Review
  (Technical and Policy)
- WRDA Deadline Rushes
- Budget Submittal Dates

COMMON PROBLEMS PROCESS

Poor Follow-Up

- Not responding to Assessments in timely manner.

- Not following up on PGM requirements for submittal of info prior to draft release or final report

COMMON PROBLEM PROCESS

- **Inconsistent Review**
- **Communications**

GENERAL PROBLEMS WITH REVIEW

- The level of review is not always understood.
- When the product is far off of the mark, specific comments are often difficult and numerous.
- Expertise and experience are often in short supply.
- Everyday pressures to achieve schedules compromises the completeness of the product

Questions?